

### **REMARKS**

The non-final Office Action was issued on pending claims 1-21. In the Office Action, claims 1-6, 9 and 12-21 stand rejected and claims 7, 8 and 11 were objected to. In this Response, claims 1 and 14 have been amended, claims 22-26 have been added and no claims have been cancelled. Thus, claims 1-26 are pending in the application.

Applicants invite the Examiner to call Applicants' representative to discuss any issues with this application.

### **Allowable Claims**

At page 5 of the Office Action, claims 7, 8 and 11 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but noted as being allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicants thank the Examiner for this notice of allowable claims.

Claims 22-25 have been added. Claim 22 corresponds to Claim 7 rewritten in independent form, claim 23 corresponds to claim 8 rewritten in independent form, and claim 24 corresponds to claim 11 rewritten in independent form.

As to claim 25, claim 25 corresponds to claim 20 rewritten in independent form including claim 14. Claim 20 claims similar subject matter as claimed in claim 11 which is allowable. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 25 is also allowable.

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 22-25 are allowable.

### **Claim 26**

Claim 26 has been added which depends from claim 14. Claim 26 further recites a display face between the keyboard face and the thumb operation face. Applicants submit that claim 26 is also allowable.

**Rejection of Claim 1: 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)**

At page 2 of the Office Action, claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Deeds* (US 6,202,257 B1). Applicants respectfully disagree.

Claim 1 has been amended to further clarify the claim. Particularly, claim 1 has been amended to clarify that the keyboard of the first component face has at least two rows of multiple input keys. Referring to the example of Applicants' invention shown in Fig. 1, the portable information terminal 10 has a keyboard face having at least two rows of multiple input keys. The keyboard has a first row of input keys 15a, 15c, etc. and a second row of input keys 15b, 15d, etc. The keyboard is capable of accepting a plurality of different user inputs.

Applicants' portable information terminal provides advantages. For example, the portable information terminal having the keyboard having at least two rows of multiple input keys can be operated with one hand of a user. The keyboard having at least two rows of multiple input keys allows for great flexibility of inputting information into the portable information terminal.

Turning to *Deeds*, *Deeds* shows and describes a handheld device 100 having control keys 104. The handheld device 100 has a side 118a having control keys 104. However, the control keys 104 on the side 118a are arranged in a single row. Accordingly, the *Deeds* handheld device 100 having a single row of control keys 104 is quite limited in flexibility of inputting information compared to Applicants' portable information terminal having a keyboard having at least two rows of multiple input keys.

Furthermore, Applicants submit that it would not be obvious to modify the *Deeds* handheld device 100 to have a keyboard on side 118a having at least two rows of multiple input keys. The *Deeds* handheld device 100 has a hand grip 108a between raised portions 110a and 112a. The handgrip 108a and raised portions 110a, 112a occupy a significant amount of space of the side 118a. As such, it appears the *Deeds* handheld device 100 does not have sufficient space to provide a keyboard having at least two rows of multiple input keys on side 118a. Furthermore, *Deeds* asserts that the handheld device 100 provides advantages by having the

handgrip 108a and the raised portions 110a, 112a. Thus, it would not be obvious to remove or modify the handgrip and raised portions to allow for a keyboard having at least two rows of multiple input keys. Even further, the handheld device 100 of *Deeds* appears to be the type of handheld device that has a touch screen, see reference no. 102. Such touch screens are usually the primary mechanism for inputting information into the handheld device. Accordingly, it would not be obvious to modify the *Deeds* handheld device 100 to have a keyboard having at least two rows of multiple input keys on the side 118a.

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that the § 102(e) objection of claim 1 has been overcome.

**Rejection of Claims 2, 6, 9, 12-14 and 18-21: 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

At page 3 of the Office Action, claims 2, 6, 9, 12-14 and 18-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Deeds* in view of *Miwa* (US 5,626,428). Applicants respectfully disagree.

As to independent claim 14, claim 14 has been amended to clarify the claim. Claim 14 pertains to a portable information terminal which allows an inputting operation with one hand and calls for a keyboard having at least four input keys arranged in a zigzag pattern in first and second key rows on the keyboard face.

Applicants respectfully submit that claim 14 is allowable. Referring to the comments above on *Deeds* in response to the rejection of claim 1, Applicants submit that it would not be obvious to modify the handheld device of *Deeds* by replacing the input keys with the input keys of *Miwa*. Furthermore, the Office Action asserts that the basis for combining *Deeds* and *Miwa* is “to improve the efficiency of entering data on a portable terminal with one hand.” However, it is improper for the Office Action to rely on Applicants’ teachings as a basis to combine prior art references. There must be some motivation, suggestion, or teaching in *Deeds* or *Miwa* of the desirability of making the combination as asserted in the Office Action. *In re Lee*, 61 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1430 (Fed. Cir. 2002), the motivation, suggestion, or teaching of the desirability of the combination must be identified in the references with specificity. *Id.*

As to the dependent claims, Applicants respectfully submit that those claims are allowable for similar reasons.

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that the § 103(a) rejection of claims 2, 6, 9, 12-14 and 18-21 has been overcome.

**Rejection of Claim 10: 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

At pages 3 and 4 of the Office Action, claim 10 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Deeds* in view of *Matthews* (US 5,432,510). Applicants respectfully disagree.

Claim 10 depends from claim 1, and as discussed above, claim 1 is allowable over *Deeds*. Applicants submit that *Matthews* does not remedy the deficiencies of *Deeds*. Thus, Applicants submit claim 10 is also allowable and the § 103(a) rejection has been overcome.

**Rejection of Claims 3-5 and 15-17: 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

At page 4 of the Office Action, claims 3-5 and 15-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Deeds* in view of *Miwa* and *Kline* (US 4,565,460). Applicants respectfully disagree.

Claims 3-5 depend from claim 1 and claims 15-17 depend from claim 14. As discussed above, claims 1 and 14 are allowable over *Deeds* in view of *Miwa*. Applicants submit that *Kline* does not remedy the deficiencies of *Deeds* and *Miwa*. Thus, Applicants submit that claims 3-5 and 15-17 are allowable and the § 103(a) rejection has been overcome.

**CONCLUSION**

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that the patent application is in condition for allowance and request a Notice of Allowance be issued.

Respectfully submitted,

BELL, BOYD & LLOYD LLC

BY 

Michael S. Leonard

Reg. No. 37,557

P.O. Box 1135

Chicago, Illinois 60690-1135

Phone: (312) 807-4270

Dated: July 8, 2003